

A N
ADDRESS

To those of the
Roman Communion

I N
ENGLAND:

Occasioned by the late
Act of Parliament,
For the further Preventing the
GROWTH of POPERY.

*Recommended to those of the Roman Com-
munion in Ireland, upon a late like Oc-
casion.*

D U B L I N :

Re-Printed by *A. Rhames* at the Back of
Dick's Coffee-House, for *Jeremy Pepyat*,
Bookseller in *Skinner-Row*, 1709.

30 12. 11 B  L

T H E

CONTENTS.

<i>THE Design of this Address,</i>	Page 1.
<i>Why those of the Roman Communion have not Reason to expect the same Toleration with other Dissenters,</i>	p. 3.
<i>Reasons to persuade those of the Church of Rome to examine the Grounds of their Religion.</i>	p. 10.
<i>Of the Infallibility of the Church of Rome.</i>	p. 17.
<i>Of Transubstantiation.</i>	p. 37.
<i>Of the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.</i>	p. 63.
<i>Of the Popes Supremacy.</i>	p. 84.

E R R A T A.

PAge 4. line 24. for *ve-* r. *very*. p. 7. l. 26. dele *in*.
p. 8. l. 21. dele *that*. p. 10. l. 13 f. *irremidable*, r. *irremedi-*
diabie. p. 12. l. 14. f. *conlude*, r. *conclude*. p. 13. l. 17. after
as, add *are*. p. 19. l. 8. f. *repare*, r. *repair*. p. 23. l. 15. af-
ter *do*, add *it*. p. 24. l. 21. f. *altogether*, r. *all together*. p.
25. l. ult. f. *Representations*, r. *Representation*. p. 26. l. 16.
f. *conlude*, r. *conclude*. p. 42. l. 2. f. *were*, r. *where*, p. 51.
l. 23. blot out *in*. p. 52. l. 10. f. *deceive*, r. *deceives*. p. 53.
l. 19. after *this*, add *is*. p. 60. l. 8. f. *now*, r. *new*. p. 62. l.
6. f. *conculude*, r. *conclude*. p. 63. l. 9. f. *Poof*, r. *Proof*. and
l. 14. f. *insensible*, r. *insensibly*. p. 64. l. 6. f. *realy*, r. *really*.
p. 68. l. 16. f. *appropriated*, r. *appropriated* p. 75. l. 9. f.
as, r. *has*. p. 90. l. 22. f. *Apstles*, r. *Apostles*. p. 92. l. 25.
f. *Eph*, r. *Ep*. p. 93. l. 26 f. *Apstles*, r. *Apostles*. p. 96. l. 12.
f. *Sacret* r. *Secret*. p. 99. l. 5. f. *Compliments*, r. *Complements*.
p. 100. l. 9. f. *selemnly*, r. *solemnly*. p. 101. l. 23. f. *belived*,
r. *believed*. p. 102. l. 2. f. *Heritick*, r. *Heretick*. p. 103. l. 19
f. *main*, r. *mean*.

100/100 100-63-

ADDRESS

Roman Communion.

THE Design of this Address is not by any means to Insult over you ; in the Circumstances under which it has pleased GOD in his Providence to bring you ; or to raise popular Odium against you. No, however necessary I may judge that which has lately been done, yet I cannot but have a great Compassion for any Thing that looks like Suffering for Conscience sake.

fake. And this, I think, I owe not only to the Principles of Humane Nature, which require that we should have a Tenderness and Pity for those that are in Affliction; but to the Principles of my Religion, as a Christian and a Member of the Church of *England*. I have always look'd upon it as one of the Glories of the Protestant Religion, that it gives the Dominion over Mens Consciences to GOD only; that it asserts the natural Liberty of Mankind to judge for themselves what it is that GOD expects from them; that it makes very charitable Allowances for the Ignorance and Mistakes of Men when joined with Sincerity and a true Love of GOD; and that in consequence of these things it does not incline its Members to a severe Inquisition into the private Opinions of Men, or to be hard upon them upon that account. And on the other side, that it has been a great aggravation of the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, that the Belief of them has been so rigidly exacted under no less Pain than *Damnation* in the other World, and the being *Burnt*, or at least *Undone* in this, whenever it has been in their Power to effect it.

But

of the Roman Communion. 3

But you will say perhaps, That if the Opinion of Protestants be so much against Persecution, how comes it to pass that there have been so many severe Laws from time to time made against you; especially *this last*, which deprives your Children of their Inheritance, if they will not renounce their Religion; and deprives you of the Comfort and Assistance of your Spiritual Fathers, by forbidding them to Exercise any Office of their Function under pain of lying in a Goal all their Lives if they are caught?

Now in answer to this, I would not aggravate Matters to make you Odious; but as plainly, and as tenderly as I can, lay the Reasons before you which, we may suppose, the Nation went upon in making these Laws, in some hopes to alleviate that Exasperation which your present Sufferings may cause, and which may very likely make you throw away, without considering, all that a Protestant can say for your Conviction.

And First, I desire you Why those of the Roman Communion have not reason to expect the same Toleration with other Dissenters.

would consider that there must be some peculiar Reason of this dealing with you under a *Prince*, and in a *Nation* so much inclined to Liberty of Conscience in almost every Body else. We have indeed, a very ill Opinion of your Errors, and the danger of them to the Souls of Men; and of the dishonour brought to GOD by giving to Creatures the Worship due only to him. But besides these, there are some things peculiar in your Religion which give Protestants just grounds of Jealousie, and make your Case very different from that of other Parties who dissent from the National Establishment.

The first is this, That you own a Dependence upon a Foreign Power, and a Power which is a declared Enemy to all Protestants. You own for the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and the Head of your Church, a Person who pretends to a Power to Depose Princes, and to give away their Dominions to such of your Church as are able to get them; and who in fact has very frequently Exercised this Power, and by it caused great Bloodshed and Disturbances in the World. Particularly, he has by Name Excommunicated Two of our own Princes,

of the Roman Communion. 5

Princes, *Henry VIII.* and Queen *Elizabeth*; and has forbid all their Subjects to obey, or assist them, and has given away their Country to any Invader that would come and take it. And he does the same in effect, every Year in the famous * *Bulla Cænæ* by our King and Government at present.

* The Form of these Bulls may be seen in *Bullar. Roman.*

You cannot wonder if Protestants are desirous at least to disarm all those who own this Man for the Vicar of Jesus Christ. And this in fact was the Cause of most of those severe Laws which have been made against you. In the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Days the Papists generally lived as easie and quiet as other Subjects; but when the Pope *Excommunicated* the Queen, and Priests were sent from the Seminaries abroad to alienate the Hearts of Her Subjects, and Conspiracies were entred into against Her; then were those severe Laws made as against those that were Enemies to the State.

It is very well known how many Conspiracies followed that Excommunication through the whole course of Her Reign, and what danger the Nation was in from

the *Spanish* Invasion, which was undertaken upon the instigation of Romish Priests, and upon the Title which the Pope gave the King of *Spain* to the Kingdom of *England*.

But I shall not insist upon these things, or the many Provocations we have had ever since to this Day; or the great Danger we may be in at present; so far I believe must appear reasonable to all indifferent Persons, that it is fit for us to make all those who expect to enjoy the Priviledges of other Subjects to renounce an Authority so dangerous to us.

It may, perhaps, be said that there are some among you who do not own the Pope to have such Authority, and that therefore we may safely deal more gently with them.

As to this, I shall not insist at present to shew how far this Power of the Popes to Excommunicate and deprive Heretical Princes and States is a Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; this is certain, that it has been long pretended to by the Head of that Church; and those who do not approve of it ought to speak out, and to renounce Communion with him as a
Tyrant

Tyrant and an Usurper, and a Heretick by pretending such Power from Jesus Christ which was never given him : But so long as they stick by him, and own him for the Head of their Church, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ, for the Judge of Controversies, and the Supreme Director of their Consciences, they must not wonder if Protestants can have no Confidence in them ; especially if we consider how many Methods of Deceit have been taught and recommended by those among them, who have been, and are still the great Guides of Consciences.

The 2d Consideration I would propose is this, That Protestants have a Right by the Principle of Self-Preservation to take such Methods with those of the Roman Communion, as may put it out of their Power to do them a Mischief ; * because Papists are obliged by the Laws of their Religion to Persecute Protestants ; and these are Laws that have been as much put in in Execution when ever it has been in their Power, and it cou'd be done with safety, as any Laws they have.

* Vid. 4 Gen. Conc. Lat. Can. 3. de Hæreticis, which is called a general council by that of Constans Sess. 19. and by that of Trent. Sess. 24.

It would be thought too invidious to reckon up all the Wars and Massacres, Burnings and Cruelties of all sorts that have been and are still in the World upon this account; especially what has been done in a manner under our view in a Neighbour Country, the sad Effects of which, not only our Selves but all the Protestant Countries in *Europe* See and Feel, by those vast Numbers of poor Creatures that flock to us to preserve their Consciences and beg their Bread: Only thus far we cannot forbear to take Notice, that there have been more hard things suffered for not submitting to the Pope, than ever were inflicted upon Christians for their Religion by all the Heathen Persecutors together.

Were these things the Effects only of sudden Passion, or Factions of State, which often do hard things to one another; there might be, however, some hope left that that it might be otherwise, should we ever again come into their Power: But when Men are Cruel upon a steady settled Principle of Persecution, there is nothing left but to guard our selves against them as well as we can. Not that we may lawfully do hard things to them because they

they have done so to us, or our Brethren ; for that would be Revenge, or at best the imitating a very bad Example : But every Man has by Nature a Right to defend himself; and if that makes it wise or necessary for him to do some things which otherwise he has no Inclination to, it is not his fault, but the fault of those who bring that necessity upon him.

We are convinced that if Popery should prevail in *England*, we should not long enjoy our Estates, or perhaps Lives, if we would not comply with it ; and we are sensible, that more than once we have been in great Danger of this ; especially lately, when it was almost a Miracle that we were saved from it. We are sensible also that the Romanists are a restless uneasie Party ; that they have mighty Dependencies Abroad which have much prevail'd of late ; that we can't tell what Foreign Power may be invited over, or in succeeding times what Encouragement they may have at Home ; and therefore we do conceive that meerly in our own Defence we may justly take as effectual Measures as we can to keep their Priests from among them, who we are satisfied have been and are like to be

be *Incendiaries* ; and to divert their *Estates* into better Hands of their own *Relations*, that they may not be turned against us. To conclude this Matter notwithstanding these Reasons, we have to guard our selves against Popery, yet there are here no Cruelties of an *Inquisition*, no *Burning*, no taking away of *Life*, no *Dragooning* ; nay, the greatest part, the Traders, and those of the poorer sort are scarce touched in this Act ; and as for others on whom it is hardest, those of *Estates*, yet there is nothing done of a sudden and irremediable ; there's Time allowed for Consideration, and Place left for Repentance and better Thoughts ; and in the mean time their Persons are secure, and they are at Liberty to go into any other Country with all the Money and Goods they can get, without danger of being sent to the Gallies, if they are caught ; which are Priviledges a great many poor Creatures we have lately heard of would take to be very great Mercies.

Reasons to persuade those of the Church of *Rome* to examine the Grounds of their Religion.

As far as a private Man may venture to give his Opinion of the Actions of his Superiors, these I suppose Joyned with some peculiar In-

of the Roman Communion. 11

Infolencies at this time, very well known in the Kingdom) were the chief Reasons the King and Parliament went upon in making this and former Laws against you; and if our Religion be True and yours False, I believe you your selves will hardly Condemn us for it. And this is the *next thing* I would desire you to consider of; that you would not take it for granted, that you are in the Right, and so call this Persecution for Conscience sake, but that you would take this Opportunity to examine the Grounds of your Religion; which will be an advantage to you which way soever the matter end.

If upon Examination you find your selves to have been in the Wrong, you will then have the Benefit and Comfort of being Converted from very dangerous Errors and Practices, and of living quietly, and preserving your Estates to your Families; but if otherwise, you find reason for your present Opinions, it will be a mighty Comfort to you in what ever you suffer, that you do it upon evidence and conviction of Conscience; and not upon Fancy and Prejudice from your Education.

And

And so much, I think, in Justice you owe to your Children, not to Breed them up in a Religion which must deprive them of their Estates, till you have well examined the Truth of it your selves : It will indeed be the greatest Blessing to them to Breed them up in the true Religion, let the Consequences as to this World be what they will ; but at least, Matters ought to be well weighed before you do what will be on all accounts so great an Injury to them, if your Religion should prove False, which perhaps, I may give you just reason to suspect before I conclude this Paper, if you will but read it without Prejudice and Partiality. Only one thing I would desire you to have a care of, that you be not too nicely sensible of the *dishonour* of changing your Opinion, now it may seem to be for your Interest. This I know is a consideration apt to work very strong, and to give a greater Biass to the Minds of some Persons than the greatest Interest in the World. But a good Christian should be contented with the Apostle to go *through evil report and good report*, and should despise the Censure of the World, so he can but please GOD and save his Soul.

And this suggests *another Consideration*, that not only your Interest in this World, but your Souls are very much concerned in this Examination. Your Church is accused by Protestants as guilty of a great number of dangerous Errors, and of very sinful Practices; of Superstition and Idolatry, of being the Authors, and consequently having the guilt of a great Schism in the Church; and it concerns you to consider whether this Charge be true, or no? Whatever Charity Protestants may have for those among you, who have no means of being better Informed, they have just reason to look upon such Errors and sinful Practices as like to be fatal to those among you who might be better informed and will not.

But there is *another Consideration*, which perhaps may weigh more with you in this Matter than the Opinion of Protestants; which is, That if this Charge against you be true; if you are guilty of Schism and Idolatry, and such gross Errors, by the Opinion of your own Divines, you cannot be Saved. This is a Matter that they themselves often urge against that Charity which Protestants are

apt to have for sincere honest People among you that are invincibly Ignorant ; besides, the very same Reasons which they urge to shew the danger that we are in, do equally hold against you, supposing that you are in the wrong. If it be *Heresy* in us to deny the Articles of your *new Creed*, supposing they are true, it must be *Heresy* in you to believe them ; supposing they are false, the Reason is the same in both ; and so as to the *Schism*, if your pretended Head of the Church be guilty of Tyranny, and Usurpation, and Heresy and Idolatry, and of imposing these upon Christians, it is He and his Followers are in the *Schism*, and not We. And then, all those dreadful things which your own Writers say against Schism and Heresy, do as much belong to you, supposing you are in the wrong ; as they do to us if we are so. And therefore if what they say, have any weight with you, it ought to make you consider seriously whether you are in the right, or no.

I the rather urge this, because it contains a full Answer to that piece of Sophistry wherewith you often deceive yourselves, and endeavour to delude us ; *That*
you

of the Roman Communion. 15

you are safe by the confession of all Sides, but we are not, and that therefore we ought in Prudence to come over unto you. Which is false ; for by your own Opinion you are not safe, but in a Damnable Condition, supposing that you are in the wrong : There is no difference at all betwixt us and you in this Matter, except only where the Truth lies. For if our charitable Opinion of the Mercy of GOD to invincible Ignorance be true, this is Comfort to us, supposing we are mistaken, as it is to you, supposing you are so ; and on the other side, if your Damning Doctrine be true, this is as dangerous to you as it is to us.

It lies therefore upon you, even from the Opinion of your own Divines, to be very impartial in examining the Grounds of your Religion ; tho' indeed our Obligation to search after Truth does not arise chiefly from the danger of being mistaken, but from that desire that every good Man should have to please GOD, and to serve him as well as he can ; and the want of this desire has more danger and malignity in it than a great many mistakes in Matters of meer Belief. To be only concerned to avoid those Errors that may Damn

us, is the same undutiful Temper toward GOD, as it would be in a Son to have no concern to please his Father, but only so far as that he may not be dis-inherited. Many Errors that may not be fatal to Ignorant People, may yet be very dishonourable to GOD, bring a great Scandal to our Holy Religion, and do a great deal of mischief in the World ; and these are things which a good Christian would have a great care of, tho' at the same time he might hope that GOD would pardon him, should he Ignorantly fall into them.

This, I hope, may be sufficient to convince you, that you ought to examine well the Grounds you go upon in your Religion. I shall now endeavour to shew you some of the Errors which we charge upon your Church, and the Reasons why we Renounced them, and why we think it your Duty to do so too.

As to the particulars, I shall chiefly confine my self to those which the *present Act* mentions, those to be renounced in the *Test*, and in the *Oath of Supremacy*.

But before I proceed to them, I would speak a little to that which is the great ground and support of all your other Errors

of the Roman Communion. 17

rors, the *Infallibility of your Church* ; which if I can shew you to be a meer pretence without any Warrant or Authority from Jesus Christ, you will then more easily hearken to what can be said in the other Matters.

It cannot be expected that I should handle these Controversies in their full extent in the short compass which it's fit this present Address should have ; but if you find what is said here to have weight in it, and that it gives you just cause of doubting, I hope you will be so kind to your selves as to come to some of our Divines who may inform you more fully, or to read some of those Books which have at large examined these Matters.

Infallibility is the thing in the World which a good Christian should have the least prejudice against ;

About the Infallibility of the Church of Rome.

for tho' I do now believe, since I see plainly that GOD has appointed no *Infallible Judge*, that it is best all things considered that there should be none : Yet I must confess, were I to judge of things by my own Reason without any regard to what GOD has done, I should be apt to think

such a Judge would be a great Blessing to the World. I could not but be very glad to find an Infallible way to end Disputes among Christians ; but Christianity has now been in the World near 1700 Years, and I do not know any Age in which there have not been great Contests and Disputes, except some few that were so stupidly Ignorant that Men hardly knew any thing of Religion, and then no wonder if there were not many Disputes ; from whence, I cannot but conclude, that either it is the will of GOD for wise Reasons, that Controversies should not be ended ; or that an Infallible Judge cannot end them, or that there has all this while been no Infallible Judge.

But to consider this Matter more methodically ; I have these *Two*, I think, strong *Reasons*, which make me conclude, there is no such Judge.

I. That you your selves are not agreed who he is. And,

II. That the Reasons commonly brought to prove that there is, or ought to be such a one, do, if well weighed, rather prove against it.

1. That you your selves are not agreed who

who he is, and this is a mighty prejudice in a thing of this Consequence ; certainly that which is appointed by GCD to end all Controversies, ought to be a thing out of Controversy it self. There ought to be a plain Commission, a plain Designation of the Person, or Persons, that Christians might know where to repare in their Difficulties. But is this Matter plain ? Can you assign us any Man, or number of Men, that have, I won't say such a Commission, but that in fact only have ever since the Apostles Days been repaired to by Christians, and looked upon as their Judge, and their Determinations thought to be Infallible . If you can, I for my part shall very thankfully submit, and own the Authority. Bt let us see what the people of your own Church say about it. You are sure that you have *Infallibility*, but you don't know where it is. Some say it is in the *Pope*, as Head of the Church, and Vicar of Jesus Christ, others say, it is in a *General Council*, but these differ. Some say, they are Infallible if Confirmed by the Pope ; others, that their Determinations do not need his *Confirmation*. But besides these, there are others that say it is (they don't

don't know how) in the *diffusive Body of the Church.*

Now pray *Gentlemen*, does this sound like the Voice of Truth, or a Method appointed by GOD to end all *Controversies*? In Matters of smaller moment we allow Men to abound in their own Sense, and to differ from one another; at least we cannot conclude they are all in the wrong because they differ; but in this we may, and ought, because if there were any such thing as Infallibility in the Church, and that designed to be the Guide of all Christians, it could not be a Secret or matter of Controversie where it was lodged; we should see the plain Appointment of GOD, or at least we should see in the History of the Church to whom Christians had appeal'd in all Ages. And for the Christian Church to be at uncertainty where to go for so long a time to end their Disputes; is the same sort of Absurdity that it would be in a Nation for 1700 Years together not to know where to go for *Justice.*

But this Absurdity will appear the greater if *we consider* besides this, that tho' the Church of *Rome* be united together in a strong Bond of External Government and Polity,

Polity, yet in truth and reality, this Difference about the Guide of their Faith, makes them *different Churches* and of *different Religions*. For a different Guide and Judge, if he be esteem'd Infallible, must make a different *Rule of Faith*; because his Determinations must be part of the Rule of Faith; and a different Rule of Faith must make a different Religion. To instance in particular, those that own *General Councils* to be Infallible, must take their Decrees as part of the *Rule* of their *Faith*; but now they that own the *Pope* for Infallible, must besides, take in all his solemn *Determinations*, and so have a much larger *Rule* of their *Faith* than the other, and in many Cases, very different, and what may be much more different than it is now; for if he be indeed Fallible, as many of them say that he is, he may determine *Vice* to be *Vertue*, and *Vertue* to be *Vice*, he may fall into great Errors, as other Fallible Men may do, and as some of them in fact have done; and yet those of that Church who own him to be Infallible, must take these things as part of the Rule of their Faith, and Manners.

These I take to be undeniable Consequences

ces from the differences among them about their Infallible Judge ; and I think, from all together, I may well infer, that there is no such thing ; since it so much concerns the World, if there be any, to be at a certainty about it ; and yet the greatest part of Christians know nothing at all of the Matter ; and those who do pretend to know it are, in truth, as much at a loss about it as those that do not ; only they agree in a Name, which leads them different ways, perhaps all wrong, and only more *Infallibly* secures them in Error.

But I would now speak a word or two to the *several Pretenders* to it. The *first Pretender* is the *Pope*, who seems indeed to have the best Pretence ; for if GOD do think fit to appoint such a one, a single Person who is always ready to hear and determine Matters, seems most proper, at least much more proper than a number of Men to be sent from all Parts of the World, who can seldom meet, and never without a great deal of trouble ; and this seems to be the most genuine Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* ; which makes the *Pope* the *Center of Unity*, makes Communion with him necessary, and a Mark of a *True Church*,

Church, and makes his Church the *Mother* and *Mistress* of all Churches; which is hardly Sense without Infallibility. But as to his Pretence, I shall consider it presently, when I come to examine his *Supremacy*, for if that fall, his Infallibility must fall along with it. One thing only I would observe here, That it seems apparent from hence, that the Primitive Church knew nothing of his Infallibility, in that they took to that troublesome and chargeable and tedious way of ending their Disputes by *Councils*; which, supposing he be appointed by GOD to determine them, and inabled to do infallibly, were not only useless and impertinent, but indeed dangerous, and very apt to turn Men from the way by which GOD had appointed the Church to be Guided. A number of Men may be good for Counsel and Assistance of one that is Fallible, but must be utterly unnecessary and an incumbrance to one that is Infallible. And therefore since the Church has always made use of *Councils* either *General* or *Provincial*, to determine Matters of *Faith*, I may certainly conclude they knew nothing of his *Infallibility*.

As

Infallibility
of General-
Councils.

As to *General Councils*, it is not our present Business to enquire of what *Use* they may be to the Church, or what *External Deference* is due to them if we could have those that are truly *General* ; but whether they are *Infallible* or not: Now as to this, I would only propose this *one short Consideration*.

That they are not of the appointment of *Jesus Christ*, but begun 300 Years after *Christ* by *Constantine* ; now whatever Wisdom there may have been in calling so many Bishops together to endeavour by their *Authority* to Compose the Differences of the Church, or to Establish good Discipline, yet it was still a Human Constitution, and I know no way to annex *Infalibility* to what is so. If 3 or 400 Men meet together, each of which is confessedly *Fallible*, they must altogether be so, unless you can shew a Promise from *Jesus Christ* to secure them from *Error* : Now if there be such a Promise as this, we *Protestants* expect to find it in *Scripture* ; but however, *you your selves* cannot pretend to it unless it be in *Scripture*, or comes down to you by *Tradition* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*. As to
Scripture

Scripture the very Name and Thing of a *General Council* is quite unknown to it; and as for *Tradition*, that could as little convey down any such Promise, for the whole Thing was unknown in the *Church* for 300 Years, not so much as the Name ever heard of.

As for the Meeting at *Jerusalem*, of which we have an account in the 15th of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, it was only a Meeting of those that were then at *Jerusalem* upon occasion of a Complaint that was brought to them: And it was a Meeting of Men, most of which were by immediate Inspiration singly *Infallible*; and therefore can be no *President* for a Meeting of *Bishops* from all Parts of the World: And much less does this which was an accidental Meeting, contain an *Institution* for the future, and a Promise to make them *Infallible* when met in a Body together, who singly are but like other Men.

If it be said, that they must be *Infallible* because they represent the *Universal Church* which is *Infallible*, the Difficulty will still return; for thô we should grant the *Church* to be *Infallible*, yet who appointed this *Representations*? did *Jesus Christ*?

Christ ? Has he annexed a promise of *Infallibility* to it ? Without such a Promise as this, there may be *Infallibility* in the *Church*, and yet 3 or 400 *Bishops*, or the Majority of them may be mistaken; they may be a Number of Men packed together to serve a *Turn*, they may be guided by Faction or Interest, by their own Interest, or the Interest of those who send them, as in fact it has been more than once ; or if they are good Men, that will not make them *Infallible*. We may contrive as wisely as we please, but we can never be certain to annex the Supernatural Assistance of GOD to our own Schemes.

To conclude this Head, If the *Infallibility* you Boast of be fixed in *General Councils*, there was none in the *Church* for 300 Years, when yet there was the most need of them, there having been a greater number of dangerous *Heresies* in that Time, than have been in the *Church* ever since. But what is worse, either there was no true *Faith* and *Religion* all that while, or else it must be granted, that we may have it without an *Infallible Guide* ; *Christians* were then, at least in this respect, in the same Condition that *Protestants* are now: And I hope
it

it will be granted, that we need not desire to be in a better than they were.

The *last* Refuge for *Infallibility*, is, that it is in the *diffusive Body of the Church*. But this I believe must be at last reduced to one or other of the former; for it will be very difficult to shew how the *Church* can exert its *Infallibility* so as to be a Guide, but either by means of its *Head* which you make the *Pope*, or else by the way of a *General Council*; there is no other way whereby those of *your Communion* can be certain what is the *Doctrine*, and what are the *Traditions* of *your Church* but one of these, and therefore having considered both of them already, I shall proceed to consider the way of Reasoning *your Divines* commonly make use of to prove that there either is, or ought to be such an *Infallible Judge*.

As for what they say from *Scripture*, it is commonly urged so coldly, and with so much diffidence, that we may see they do not lay any great stress upon it: But that you may not be amused only with some general Words, in truth nothing to the purpose, I desire you would consider, that there being no *Infallibility* which can serve

to be *your Guide* but only that of the *Pope*, or a *General Council*, nothing from *Scripture* can be pertinent, but that which proves either the one or the other. No Man, or or number of Men can be *Infallible* without a particular Assistance, and we cannot be sure *they* are so without a particular Promise. And therefore when you hear any thing alledged from *Scripture*, only ask *your selves*, What does this prove? Does it prove the *Pope* to be *Infallible*? Or does it prove a *General Council* to be so? If it do not prove one of them, it proves nothing in this Matter, for you are never the nearer *your Guide* for any thing else.

Now as to *General Councils*, I have shew'd already, that there is not the least hint of them in *Scripture*; and as for the Title of the *Pope* to it, I shall consider it presently in examining his *Supremacy*: And in the mean time shall take notice a little what they urge from *Reason* to prove that there ought to be such a *Judge*; ought to be I say, for all the *Reason* in the World without a *Revelation* from GOD can never prove that there is one, it being a thing that depends meerly upon the appointment and good pleasure of GOD.

The

The Writers of the *Romish Church*, it must be confessed, talk Plausibly enough when they expose the Weakness of Human Understanding, and the Infirmities of Human Nature; and I must say that in reading of them I could hardly forbear, at least to wish, that if it had pleased GOD, some effectual Remedy had been provided to secure Men from Error. But this did not at all influence me to think that GOD had done so, and that upon these Three Accounts.

1. Because we see in fact, that neither Mankind in general, nor Christians in particular have been secured from Errors; that there have been as many Contests and Differences among Christians as we can suppose there would have been, taking it for granted that they were left in the State, we say they were, without any *Infallible Guide* to direct them; and therefore whatever force such a Consideration from the necessity of ending Controversies might have had in the first Times of our Religion; the matter of Fact does now in a great measure take it off; because in 1700 Years the *Church* has not been freed from them. From whence, as I said

before, we may infer, either that it is not the Will of GOD that Controversies shou'd be ended, or that an *Infallible Judge* will not end them, or that there is no *Infallible Judge*; either of which, takes away the force of this Argument.

2. Because this whole way of Arguing from the weakness of our Understanding, and proness to Error, and the like, proves nothing in particular, and consequently does not bring us at all nearer Satisfaction than we were before. The most natural *Inference* from it is, That every Man is to be of the Religion of his Country; for that makes through work, and excuses us from using our Fallible Reason at all in the Matter; whereas in *your Way*, however you may cry out of the uncertainty of our own Reason, yet you must use it in a great many material Points, and indeed, found all the certainty *you* have upon it; *you* must for instance, Judge by your own Reason, whether the *Christian Religion* be true, or not; whether among all the Professors of Christianity, *yours* be the *True Church*; whether there be any *Infallible Judge* or no, and who he is, and what his Determinations are. These are things of great

great weight, and of a great latitude, and indeed take in the chief Points of Religion, and yet these things must be judged of by that Reason which GOD has given every Man, or they cannot be judged of at all ; whereas *your* whole way of Arguing from the fallibility of our Understanding, either proves that we cannot judge with certainty of these Matters, or it proves nothing.

3. This whole way of talking is to me a strong prejudice against what you would prove by it. For if you had a plain Institution or a Promise of such a Judge to shew, there would be no need of this Arguing, that would be Sufficient ; and without that, no Man can be *Infallible* ; and we may be sure that Men have no such Commission or Promise to shew, when they are forced to use so much Cavilling and Dispute about the matter, which is, indeed, nothing to the purpose without the other.

We do with much more reason infer, that since GOD has not thought fit to give any such *Commission*, that therefore we must make the best of those other means which he is pleased to allow us ; to *search the Scriptures*, and endeavour to understand them

them as well as we can. And this is the Method that our *Saviour* directed, *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life, and they testifie of me.* From which Words, we may plainly infer these following things.

(1.) That the *Jews* had at that time no *Infalible Guide* in Matters of Religion; for if they had our *Saviour* would have directed them thither, but we see he directs them to the *Scripture*.

2. We may infer that the Persons our *Saviour* spoke to, had without an *Infalible Guide* sufficient Abilities to understand the *Scriptures*, and to have true *Faith*; otherwise we may be sure he would not have sent them thither, and if they could understand the *Old Testament* without such a Guide, much more may Christians understand the *New* which is much easier.

3. We may infer that Private Persons, (for such our *Saviour* spoke to) may have sufficient assurance of *Divine Truths* from examining the *Scriptures*, tho' they go against the Governors of the *Church*; for our *Saviour* tells them, that they might find in the *Scriptures*, that he was the True *Messias*, tho' the *Chief Priests* did at that time

of the Roman Communion. 33

time reject him, and were afterwards the Authors of his Crucifixion : All which do absolutely overthrow the necessity of an *Infallible Judge* in order to *True Faith*. And there cannot be one thing said against *Protestants* examining the *Scriptures* now, but what would have held as well, against the Command of our Saviour here to the *Jews* ; unless they can shew us a positive Institution of an *Infallible Guide* ; but all the Arguments from Reason, and the imperfection of our Understanding are perfectly the same in both Cases.

The truth is, all our Saviour's Preaching did suppose this, for it had been a vain thing to Preach to People who had not Abilities to Understand : And if we go further, to the Preaching of the Apostles, we shall find that they endeavoured to prove the truth of what they said out of the *Scriptures*, by which they appealed to the Understanding of their Hearers, and made them proper Judges of what they said, as far as their own Salvation was concerned in it. We see in *Acts*. 17. 11. The *Bereans* were commended as more *noble than those of Thessalonica, because they searched the Scriptures daily to see whether the things*
the

the Apostles preached were so, or not. The Apostle St. *John* commands Christians *to try the Spirits*; that is, to examine the pretences that any should make to the Spirit of GOD, which supposes that their Understanding, how fallible soever, was sufficient to judge in these Matters.

In a word, the writers and Emissaries of the Church of *Rome*, do themselves, when they don't think of it, in effect confess this; for when they bring *Scripture*, and other Arguments to persuade us to come over to *their Church*, I would ask them, are we proper Judges of these things, or are we not? Will our Faith be a true Faith, that is founded upon these *Scriptures*, or these Reasons that you here bring? If it be so, then we may understand for ourselves, and there is no necessity in order to true Faith, of an *Infallible Judge*; but if it be not so, there ought to be then an end of Disputes; for it's in vain to Dispute where it's supposed that we cannot Understand or Judge; and all offering of *Scripture* or *Reason* to prove the truth of their Opinions is only affront and mockery.

of the Roman Communion. 35

But it may be it will be said, Don't we see People differ about the Interpretation of *Scripture* ? some go one way and some another, and yet all are confident of their own ; how can we be sure that we are in the right any more than they who are as confident in what they say as we are.

Now this Objection is founded upon this, that we cannot have certainty of what is once Disputed ; which is contrary to the Common Opinion of Mankind, who would have done Disputing, if they thought they could not be certain when once Men differed from them. This does indeed overthrow all Reason and Religion. Some have ventured to Dispute the *Being* of *GOD*, and many more the *Truth* of the *Christian Religion*, and yet I hope we may be very certain of the Truth of both these. But I would only urge at present this *one Consideration*. Are all the World agreed about their *Infalible Judge* ? If not, how can they be certain of that ? But to press this Matter a little more plainly ; they say for instance, that we can't from *Scripture* be certain of the Divinity of our Saviour, because the *Socinians* a small number of Men, dispute that Matter. But the same

But Socinians

Socinians deny their *Infallible Judge*, and therefore that must at least be as uncertain as the other : And not only the *Socinians*, but all *Protestants* deny it, which must make it still more uncertain ; and not only all the *Protestants*, but the *Greek, Armenian, Æthiopian Churches* ; a vast Body of Men, which must still add to the uncertainty ; and not only all these, but all that in any Age or Nation have ever differed from the Church of *Rome* ; for whoever differs from them, must deny their *Infallibility* ; and consequently this must have been Disputed not only as much as any one Point, but as much as all the rest together.

This, I think, is a demonstrative Answer to this whole way of Arguing, and shews the manifest Absurdity of it ; for it makes things uncertain because they are Disputed, and yet makes the most Disputed thing in all the World the Foundation of all the certainty they have.

I have been the longer in examining this Point of the *Infallibility* of your Church, as being that which is the great support of all your other Errors.

I now proceed to speak something to the Particulars I promised; and first I shall begin with *Transubstantiation*, which is the first thing Renounced in the *Test*.

The Sense of the Church of *England* in this Matter seems to be this, That tho Believers in the faithful and due receiving of this Holy Sacrament are made Partakers of the *Benefits* of the Death of *Christ*, that is of the breaking of his Body and the shedding his Blood, and so may be properly enough said to be Partakers of his Body and Blood, yet that which they take into their Mouths is really but Bread and Wine set apart for a holy Use, to represent the breaking of the Body and the shedding of the Blood of our Blessed Saviour; and therefore in a *Sacramental Sense*, may be called his Body and Blood, tho in *truth* and *reality* they are but Bread and Wine.

Both Sides do in some Sense own a *real Presence* of *Christ* in this Sacrament, but this one thing, if observed, will sufficiently shew the difference; that *Protestants* say, that in the devout and holy Use of this Sacrament, *Christ* will be present with his Grace and Assistance to the Souls of good People; but that the Things which appear

before us, which we Eat and Drink, are not Christ, but Bread and Wine.

Those of the *Church of Rome* on the other side, say, that the Things which lie before them, which they put into their Mouths, thô before *Consecration* they are Bread and Wine, yet upon pronouncing those Words, *This is my Body*, and *this is my Blood*, they lose their own *Nature & Substance* of Bread and Wine, and become *very Christ*, the very same Christ that was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, and that suffered upon the Cross. And therefore pay them the same Divine Honour and Worship as if GOD or Christ did truly and openly appear before them.

Now the whole ground of this Dispute lies in the Words of the *Institution*, *This is my Body*, and *this is my Blood*. They say, that the Words ought to be understood in the plain literal Sense; We say they ought to be understood as used by Christ in his Instituting a *Sacrament*, that is, appointing one thing to be a *representation* and a *memorial* of another; and which because it does represent, may very well be called by the Name of that Thing which is represented by it, which we think to be a very natural, easy way
of

of the Roman Communion. 39

way of speaking, and agreeable as to that present occasion, so to other Forms of Speech of the same Nature which had been in use among those People to whom our Saviour spoke.

But in particular, the time in which our Saviour Instituted this Sacrament was when they had been eating the *Passover*; which was a Feast much of the same Nature among the *Jews* that this is among *Christians*; that was appointed by GOD in memory of their Deliverance when the Angel of GOD destroyed the *First-born* of all the *Egyptians*, and this in memory of that much greater Blessing to Christians by the Death and Sufferings of Jesus Christ. As therefore the Master of the Family when he distributed the *Paschal Lamb*, was to say, *This is the Lord's Passover*, as being Instituted in memory of the Lord's *passing over* the Houses of the *Israelites*; so now our Saviour being to Institute a new Sacrament for his Church of *Christians*, as that was for the *Jews*, he appoints a memorial of the breaking of his Body and the shedding of his Blood, and in the very same figure of Speech that the other was. *This is my Body*, or this is *the Lord's Body*,

could be no strange form of Speech to them, who just before had heard him say, *This is the Lord's Passover*, and who had been constantly used to that form of Speech. And accordingly, we do not find that they were in any difficulty or surprize in the Matter, which they could not have avoided if the Words are to be understood just as they sound; for it was a Matter more than a little amazing, especially to those who never had been used to such sort of Mysteries, that their Master should take a piece of Bread in his Hand, and with speaking a few Words, should make it become, without any apparent Change, that very Body which was then standing before them. That he should hold his own Body whole and entire in his own Hand; that they should put the same *one* Body whole and entire into each of their Mouths, that they should *eat* him first, and *drink* him afterwards, and yet that he should stand by them *untouched* all the while; besides, the very uncouthness and horror of the Institution, to eat their Master, a Person whom they loved, and had reason to love, and to drink Human Blood; these are things one would think, should at least, surprize them

them a little, and make them ask some Questions about it; for they are indeed strange monstrous Absurdities; whereas the Sense we give to the Words is natural and easy, especially to the Persons to whom they were spoken, as being used to such Expressions, and who had heard the like but just before, in a like Case.

I have this one thing more to add in this Matter, That as the *Jewish* Sacraments were *Signs & Representations* as well as ours, and so were commonly called by the Name of what they represented; so the inward Blessing conveyed to them was the same that is conveyed by the Christian Sacraments; and therefore the Apostle tell us, they *did all eat of the same spiritual Meat, and drank of the same spiritual Drink, for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was*

1 Cor. 10.
3, 4.

Christ. Now here is altogether as plain evidence that the *Jews* did Eat and drink Christ before he was Born as the *Christians* do since: But that is a way of *Transubstantiation* which those of the Church of *Rome* don't yet acknowledge; and we may conclude, that if the Apostle had known any thing of that Doctrine a-

mong Christians he would have been more wary in his Expressions, and not have weakend the Credit of it by using the same sort of Words were nothing of the same thing was meant.

From hence we may give an Account of that large Discourse of our Saviour in the 6th Chapter of St. *John*, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed, &c.* For if he were Meat and Drink to the Jews so long before he was born, he might in the same manner be Meat and Drink to them still without the portentous way of putting his Body into their Mouths.

Christ is said to be a *Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World*; and in the same Sense was Meat and Drink to all good People from the Foundation of the World; that is, the benefits of his Death reach backward even to the beginning of the World, though he were put to Death several Thousand Years after. And they are the Benefits of his Death which are the great *Food of Souls*, that which gives, and preserves Life in them, as the Life of the Body is kept up by Meat and Drink.

And this suggests *another Consideration*, That we may know what sort of Eating this

of the Roman Communion. 43

this is, if we only consider what sort of *Life* is kept up by it. The eating and drinking of a *Body* is proper to keep up the *Life* of a *Body*, but it's only the inward Grace and Assistance of GOD that keeps up the *Life* of a *Soul*; and therefore we then Eat and Drink for that, when we do by Faith or any other Method take in that spiritual Nourishment.

In a Word, our Saviour says, *He gave his Flesh for the Life of the World*, and we may then not improperly be said to Eat his Flesh, when we receive in that Spiritual Life and Nourishment procured by it. And that this is the Sense is apparent from several Expressions in that Discourse, as in *vers. 35. And Jesus saith unto them, I am the Bread of Life, he that cometh to me shall never Hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never Thirst*: In which Words there are two Things which directly contradict this gross Sense of Eating his very Body; First that he alters here the Expression of Eating, and so explains himself, *whosoever comes to me, and whosoever believes in me*, which shews that this Blessing comes by *Believing* in Christ, and not by gross carnal *Eating*. Secondly, The Blessing it self
is

is such as does not belong to all that only externally receive the Sacrament, but to such only as come to Christ with true Faith; as may be seen, not only in this Verse but every where, through that Discourse; thus *vers. 51. If any Man Eat of this Bread he shall Live for ever. And vers. 53, 54. Verily I say unto you, except ye Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you, whosoever eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last Day.* Which words are very true if understood of the feeding our Souls by the Benefits received from the Body and Blood of Christ; but cannot be understood of external Eating of him in the Sacrament; for very wicked Men often do that according to the Opinion of the *Romish Church*, and are only the worse instead of being the better for it.

This I believe is abundantly sufficient to shew that the Sense we put upon the Sacramental Words, *This is my Body*, &c. is natural and easie, agreeable to the design of a Sacrament, and other Expressions of the same kind in Scripture; and if it be so, we need not be solicitous to prove any thing

nothing more about it ; for there are so many Absurdities and gross Contradictions in the contrary Opinion, that we ought to lay hold of any thing that can but make Sense of the Words, and avoid those Monstrous Absurdities.

But I shall now endeavour to prove from the Words themselves, that the Sense which the Church of *Rome* puts upon them, cannot be the true Sense of them.

i. The Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is, that our Saviour by pronouncing these words *this is my Body*, made that to be his Body which before was only Bread ; but certainly the literal Sense of the Words does not import any thing of this, and it's the literal Sense which they must stick to, or else the whole support of their Cause is gone ; now according to all the Rules of speaking it ought to have been his Body before he could truly pronounce it to be so ; but this they deny, and say it was only Bread till these words were pronounced, and that the calling it his Body made it become so ; which is a form of Speech quite unknown to the World, and I challenge them to bring any Author either Sacred or Prophane that ever made use of

of Words of this kind in such a Sense.

① Since therefore it is confessed, that what our Saviour took into his Hands was *Bread*, and that it remained *Bread* till the speaking of these words, *This is my Body*, and since those words in their natural construction cannot be understood to effect any Change, it must remain *Bread* still; and be only the *Body of Christ* in such a Sense as *Bread* may be called his *Body*, that is in such a Sense as the *Lamb* they eat of but just before was called the *Passover*; by being a Representation and Commemoration of it.

2. Another Argument I would make use of is this, that our Saviour did not by pronouncing those Words make what he gave them to be his very *Body* and *Blood*, because after the pronouncing of them, he calls what he gave in the *Cup* the *Fruit of the Vine*. *Verily I say unto you I will drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine, until that day that I drink it new in the Kingdom of GOD*; In which Words are contained these three, I think, plain *Reasons*, which prove, that it was *Wine* and not his *Blood* that he gave them.

of the Roman Communion. 47

1. That He expressly calls it the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the Words, they say, are to be taken in the literal Sense, and literally nothing else is the Fruit of the Vine but *Wine*, at least, the Blood of Christ is not.

2. In his saying that he would drink no more of it till he drank it new in the Kingdom of GOD, it is supposed that he had heretofore drank of what he then gave them. But I suppose, it will hardly be said, that he ever before drank his own Blood.

3. As the Words suppose that he had drank before of what he then gave them, so they do that he would drink of it again; which very likely must be understood of his *eating and drinking with them after his Resurrection*, for then the Kingdom of GOD, that is, the new State of the Christian Church, was come. And therefore unless the Blood of Christ can be properly called the *Fruit of the Vine*; unless it can be supposed that he had drank his own Blood before, and did design to drink it afterward, these Words must evince, that it was Wine which he then gave them.

I would not conceal that, tho' St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, recite the Words which I have Quoted, after the Consecration of the

the

That

the Cup, yet one of the *Evangelists* *St. Luke* recites them before, and so they may seem to relate to a Cup that went about the Table at the *Paschal Supper*. But this Objection, if well considered, does rather the more confirm what I have been proving; for two of the *Evangelists* do place it immediately after the Consecration and delivery of the *Sacramental Cup*, and in them it is apparent they can refer to nothing else but that. Now if our Opinion about this Sacrament, be true, the difference betwixt the *Evangelists* in this Case, is not material, as importing no difference at all in the Doctrine of the Sacrament, tho' our Saviour's Words are reported different ways, and so this secures the Honour and Authority of all the *Evangelists*. But if our Saviour's Words are to be understood, as the Church of *Rome* understands them, it's impossible in any tolerable manner to reconcile the *Evangelists*; for *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark*, must, upon this Supposition, not only put his Words wrong together, and out of that order he spoke them, but must also quite misrepresent his Meaning, and that in a Point of great Consequence; which, I believe, can be no way consistent with the Opinion which

which the Church of GOD has always had of these *Gospels*. But I shall consider this Matter a little more fully in that which I have to urge in the *third Place*.

③. I desire it may be consider'd that the Words of our Saviour in the Institution of this Sacrament cannot be understood *literally*, because as they are recited by the Evangelists they are not *literally* the same, but differ as to the *literal* meaning very materially. St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* in the Institution of the Cup re-

Matth. 26. 28.

Mark 14. 24.

Luke 22. 20.

cite our Saviour's Words thus,
This is my Blood of the New
Testament which is shed for you;

St. *Luke* recites them thus, *This is the New Testament in my Blood*. Now from this difference among them, I would observe these *Two Things*.

①. That the *Evangelists* being so little curious to recite the very same Words that our Saviour spake, could not have any Notion of a strict necessity of a literal meaning, and of such a strange Doctrine which could have no foundation but in the literal Interpretation of the very Words that he spake; this had been at best very strange negligence in a Matter of so great Consequence.

2. I would observe that if our Interpretation of the Words be true, the *Evangelists* are easily reconciled, as agreeing in the same general Sense tho' differing in the Expressions; because both of them denote a Commemoration of the Blood of Christ, and of the *New Testament* or *Covenant* founded upon it; and it is not, then, very material which is placed first; but if they are to be taken *literally*, it's impossible ever to make them agree; and so one of the *Evangelists* must not only have mis-recited our Saviour's Words, but quite have mis-understood his meaning, and have done what he could to lead People wrong in a great Point of Faith: For certainly the *true, real* Blood of Christ is a very different thing from the *New Covenant* or *Testament* which is founded upon it.

But it will appear still of greater Consequence to keep to the very Words which Christ spake if the Opinion of the Church of Rome be true, that it is the repeating the Words of our Saviour which effects the Transubstantiation. For I would ask, Supposing a Man should Consecrate with the Words of St. Luke, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, would that change the
Wine

Wine (not to say the *Cup*) into the very *Blood* of Christ? Certainly it would not do it by force of those Words, for they intimate no such thing; and it is not unlikely but those were the very Words our *Saviour* spake, for not only *St. Luke* uses them, but *St. Paul*, and that upon a solemn occasion when it concerned him much to give a true Representation of this Sacrament; as you may see, *1 Cor. Chap. 11*. The occasion of his mentioning the Institution of this Sacrament was very great Irreverence, which some were guilty of in receiving of it, indeed such, as it was almost impossible for them to be guilty of, had they believed what the Church of *Rome* now believes about it; it was therefore very necessary that the Apostle should speak clearly and plainly out *in this matter*; and we see he does solemnly utter in what he says with the Authority of Christ, *For I have received of the LORD, that which I also delivered unto you, in, &c.* And then he repeats the Words as *St. Luke* does; and not only so, but calls the other part of the Sacrament *Bread* near ten Times in that Chapter.

4. The last Argument I shall make use
F 2 of

of upon this Head, is this, That the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* upon another account does not agree with the Words of our Blessed Saviour. The Opinion of that Church is, That under each *Species*, as they call it, whole *Christ* is contained, *Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity*; so that both are but just the very *same Thing*, in nothing different, but in outward *appearance*, which only deceive our Senses. And it is upon this Opinion chiefly, that they ground the denial of the *Cup* to the People; because, say they, should they have the *Cup*, they would have no more, but just the very same thing they had in the other Kind: And supposing their Opinion true, the Argument may, for any thing I know, have some force in it; but then they ought not to deny us leave to Argue the other way; That, that Opinion must needs be false, which makes our Saviour guilty of a great Absurdity in appointing two *Kinds*, but both really the *same thing*, and one of them perfectly unnecessary.

But that which I would chiefly take notice of is, That this Doctrine of theirs, contradicts the *Words* of our Saviour, for what they make but *One Thing* he plainly makes

Two,

Two, and calls them by *Two* different Names. The one he calls his *Body*, the other he calls his *Blood*, which supposes them to be *Two* different Things, as plain as Words can express them.

They say indeed, That in the *Glorified Body of Christ*, the Body and Blood cannot be separated, and therefore were the Words to be taken in such a Sense as to consider them separated, they would contain a great Absurdity ; so that wherever the one is, the other by *concomitancy* must be there too.

But who told them, that the *Glorified Body of Christ* is in the Sacrament ? The Words of the Institution intimate no such thing, but speak of his Body *given*, and his Blood *shed*, which certainly was *separate* from his Body. But however, this arguing from Reason against the Words, and is just the very same thing which they condemn as *Heretical* in us ; and if this be once allowed, they must throw off the whole Doctrine ; for we can shew them Ten times as many Absurdities in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as they can in supposing the Body and blood of Christ to subsist separately.

In short, either we must stick to the very Words of our Blessed Saviour, or we must not ; if we must, their Opinion must be false ; which makes what our Saviour calls *Two* Things, to be but *One* ; if we must not stick to the very Words, but interpret them according to right Reason and other Places of Scripture, they then give up their Cause.

To conclude this Head, What Reason can there be imagined why our Saviour should in a solemn manner, at different Times, and under different Names, give the very same thing ? call the one his *Body*, and the other his *Blood*, when according to the Nature of the Thing he might as well have inverted the Names, and have called that his *Blood*, which he calls his *Body*, and so on the other side. There cannot, I believe, be any Reason thought of but only this, That the one Kind, the *Bread*, was very proper to represent the breaking of his Body ; the other the *Wine*, to represent the shedding of his Blood ; which is the very thing that we would have ; for then there is a sufficient Reason for these Names without any *Bodily* Presence at all.

I have been the longer in considering the Sense of the *Scripture* in this Matter, because your Writers commonly boast more of the *Scripture* being for you in this Case, than in any other Controversies betwixt us : And, I think, I have proved more than I need have done, in proving that the Sense your Church puts upon the Words of our Saviour, *cannot* be the true Sense of them : It being sufficient in a Matter of this Nature, which is loaded with so many Absurdities, to have shewed that they did *fairly* admit of another Interpretation.

But having so fully Confuted this Doctrine out of the Scriptures, I am now more at liberty to shew you the gross Absurdities and the monstrous Contradictions that are involved in it ; tho' in truth, it is so full fraught with Contradictions, that it's a hard matter to know where to begin ; I shall therefore content my self just to repeat some of them which are ready Collected to my hand, by a Great Divine of our own.

‘ That there should be Accidents without a Subject ,
‘ that is, That there should be, length and nothing

Chillingworth,
p. 165.

‘ nothing long, breadth and nothing broad,
‘ thickness and nothing thick, whiteness
‘ and nothing white, roundness and no-
‘ thing round, weight and nothing heavy,
‘ sweetness and nothing sweet, moisture
‘ and nothing moist, fluidness and nothing
‘ flowing, many actions and no agent, ma-
‘ ny passions and no patient, that is, that
‘ there should be a long, broad, thick,
‘ white, round, heavy, sweet moist, flow-
‘ ing, active, passive nothing.

‘ That Bread should be turned into the
‘ Substance of Christ, and yet not any
‘ thing of that Bread become any thing of
‘ Christ, neither the Matter, nor the Form,
‘ nor the Accidents of Bread, be made ei-
‘ ther the Matter or the Form or the Ac-
‘ cidents of Christ.

‘ That Bread should be turned into no-
‘ thing, and at the same time with the
‘ same Action be turned into Christ, and
‘ yet that Christ should not be nothing.

‘ That the same thing at the same time
‘ should have it's just dimensions, and just
‘ distance of it's Parts one from another,
‘ and at the same time should not have it,
‘ but all its Parts together in the self-same
‘ Point.

‘ That

of the Roman Communion. 57

‘ That the Body of Christ which is
‘ much greater should be contained wholly
‘ in that which is less, and that not once
‘ only, but as many times over as there
‘ are Points in the Bread and Wine.

‘ That the same thing at the same time
‘ should be wholly above it self, and whol-
‘ ly below it self, within it self and with-
‘ out it self, on the right Hand and on the
‘ left Hand, and round about it self.

‘ That the same thing at the same time
‘ should move to and from it self and lie
‘ still ; or that it should be carried from
‘ one place to another through the middle
‘ space, and yet not move.

‘ That to be One should be to be undi-
‘ vided from it self, and yet that one and
‘ the same thing should be divided from
‘ it self.

‘ That a finite thing may be in all Pla-
‘ ces at once.

‘ That there should be no certainty in
‘ our Senses, and yet that we should know
‘ some things certainly, and know nothing
‘ [Corporal] but by our Senses.

‘ That, that which is, and was long ago,
‘ should now begin to be. That the same
‘ thing should be before and after it self.

‘ That

' That it should be possible that the same
 ' Man, for Example, You or I, may at the
 ' same time be a wake at *London*, and not
 ' awake but asleep at *Rome* ; there run or
 ' walk, here not run or walk, but stand
 ' still, sit, or lie down ; there study or write,
 ' here do nothing but dine or sup ; there
 ' speak, here be silent ; that he may in one
 ' place freeze with cold, in another burn
 ' with heat ; that he may be drunk in one
 ' place, sober in another ; valiant in one
 ' place, a coward in another ; a Thief in
 ' one place, and honest in another ; that
 ' he may be a Papist and go to Mass in
 ' *Rome*, a Protestant and go to Church in
 ' *England* ; that he may die in *Rome*, and
 ' live in *England* ; or dying in both Places,
 ' may go to Hell from *Rome*, and to Hea-
 ' ven from *England*.

' That the Body and Soul of Christ
 ' should cease to be where it was, and yet
 ' not go to another place, nor be destroyed.

These are some of those monstrous Con-
 tradictions which are involved in this Do-
 ctrine of *Transubstantiation* ; I shall only
 observe these few things more about this
 Matter, and then conclude this Point..

TRANSUBSTANTIATION

I. That

of the Roman Communion. 59

1. That you ought not for the *avoiding* of these Difficulties to content your selves to believe in general that some-how or other, you don't know how, this Sacrament is the Body of Christ; for your Church has determined the Matter, that it is the very Body of Christ which was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, and was afterward Crucified, and that there remains no *substance* of Bread but only *this Body* of Christ after Consecration.

2. I would observe that none of these Difficulties are taken off by considering Christ's Body as *glorified*, for besides, that if it be a *Body* still, it must have the Properties of a Body, this Sacrament was Instituted while our Saviour lived in the World, and had just such a Body as other Men, of the same bigness, and all other qualities as to his Body the same. And therefore in interpreting these Words *This is my Body*, all the Difficulties are still the same as if he were now living; or as they would be, were they spoken of the Body of any other Man.

3. I desire that you would consider that you may be sure we do not mis-understand nor mis-represent your Opinion, because
these

these Absurdities are what *your own Divines* take notice of, as well as *ours*, and do not pretend to be able to give any direct Answer to them.

4. I would observe, That tho' these Contradictions are so apparent and staring that no Body that hears of this Doctrine can well miss of them, yet they are now, and none of them ever heard of in the Church for many Hundred Years ; from whence we infer, that the Doctrine it self was as little heard of.

5. We do not find that any Christian for many Hundred Years ever denied or disputed the truth of this Doctrine, from whence we cannot but conclude, that it was then unknown in the Church ; for it must have had strange good fortune to escape without any Contradiction, when all the Articles of the Creed had been Disputed round.

6. As this was not disputed or denied by any Christians, so neither was it objected against the Christian Religion by any Heathen, not even by *Julian* himself, who, as being an *Apostate*, must have known all the Secrets of our Religion ; whereas in truth, there had been Ten times more weight

weight in this, than in all the Objections together which they made use of against Christianity.

7. There were several things in the Primitive Church inconsistent with the belief of this Doctrine, in particular that of mixing *Water* with the Wine, the Water to represent the *People*, as the Wine represented the Blood of Christ; of which St. *Cyprian* gives us a full Account. Vid. Cyp. Epist. 63.

8. I would observe, That the Church of *Rome* can assign no peculiar necessity, or usefulness of this Sacrament above others, that should give a probable Reason of the mighty difference betwixt this and others, and of such a strange wonderful Dispensation as the *eating our Blessed Saviour himself*: Nay, with them both *Baptism* and *Confession* are esteemed much more necessary, and the omission of them much more dangerous than the omission of this Sacrament.

9. To conclude this whole Matter, I think, I have sufficiently shewed that this Doctrine has no foundation in Scripture; I would have considered at large the Sense of the Primitive Church in it; and I do not question but to have been able very clear-

ly to make out that it was a Doctrine quite unknown to the Church of GOD for many Ages ; but that was not consistent with the Brevity I am at present forced to use ; I would therefore only observe this one thing, That we ought not to conculude this to have been the Doctrine of the *Fathers* only from some *accidental* or *general Expressions* which they sometimes make use of ; It's plain that none of them *designedly* treat of this Matter, or *explain* it to us, none of them recite it among the *Articles of their Faith*, none of them take any notice of the *difficulties* of it, no Christians appear to have been *shocked* at this Doctrine, and no Heathens to have *Objected* it ; all which could hardly have been avoided had this been the constant Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*.

43 And as for *General Expressions*, the calling what they received the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, that could not be avoided, the *Nature of the thing* requiring them even according to *our* Opinion of this Matter : And we see that notwithstanding we have made such expresse Declarations against the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and that by reason of this Controversy we expresse
our

our selves more *cautiously*, than we may suppose the *Fathers* would do before any Controversy was moved about it, yet some general Expressions of our own *Divines* are often turned against us by those of the Church of *Rome*, and there is no question but were the Authors of them as Old as the *Fathers*, they would be as confidently quoted for the Proof of *Transubstantiation* as any Sayings of the *Fathers* now are.

And this shews us how this Doctrine, tho' monstrous in it self, might under the Covert of such General Expressions, without any great stir or bustle, *insensible* creep into the Church, especially in very *Ignorant* and *Superstitious* Times; tho' after all, our *Divines* have sufficiently traced the footsteps of it, and shewed the progress it made, and the opposition it met with in the World before it could be *Established*. *IDOLATRY*

The next thing to be spoken to is, the *Idolatry of the Church of Rome*. In the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, and in the *Invocation of the Blessed Virgin*, and of other *Saints*, as it is *practised* in that Church.

Now Idolatry may be of *two sorts*.

I. When People worship any thing for the *Supreme GOD*, which really is not so.

G 2.

II. When

II. When they give that *Worship* to any *Creature*, which is due only to *GOD*, and which he has *appropriated* to himself.

As to the first sort of *Idolatry* that of Worshipping some thing as the *Supreme GOD* which really is not so, we do not charge the Church of *Rome* with it, unless perhaps the Worshipping of what is but *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament instead of *Jesus Christ* may come under that head; I say, *perhaps* here, because I would not enter into any thing besides the main cause, that may be contested; for tho' *Jesus Christ* be *GOD*, and they worship some thing as *Jesus Christ* which is not so, yet the mistake being chiefly about his *Human Nature*, I would not positively affirm a thing which may bring on any dispute, which is not to our purpose.

This they do not deny, that they give the highest Divine Worship, which they call *Latria*, to that Object, which they take into their Hands, and put into their Mouths in receiving this Sacrament; which I shall at present call *Idolatry*, but with a promise to recant it whensoever they shall answer the Reasons I have given to prove that what they thus Adore is only *Bread*
and

of the Roman Communion. 65

and Wine ; or whenever they shall give me a more proper Name, by which I may call that great Sin of giving the *highest Divine Worship* to a *Creature*. The truth is, that such a *Worship* may not only be called *Idolatry*, but the most absurd and senseless *Idolatry*, that ever the World fell into : But this I shall not now insist upon, having spoken so much already to that which is the foundation of it, the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

The other Matter in which we charge them with *Idolatry*, is, the *Invocation* of the *Blessed Virgin*, and other *Saints*. Now in this we do not charge them with owning any of those to be *GOD*, but only with giving them that *Worship* and *Honour* which cannot lawfully be given to any thing which is but a *Creature*. In speaking to this, I shall consider these *Two things*.

1. Whether the giving to a *Creature* the *Worship* due only to *GOD*, may not be properly termed *Idolatry*, tho' at the same time we pay that *Worship*, we own it not to be *GOD*, but a *Creature* ?

2. Whether the *Worship* given to *Saints* by the *Invocation* practised in the Church of *Rome*, be of that sort, such as *GOD* has

appropriated to himself, and consequently such as becomes Idolatrous when applied to a Creature,

I. As to the first of these, Those of the *Roman Church* cannot deny but it must be a very great Sin to give the *Worship* of *GOD* to *Creatures* ; but they deny it to be properly *Idolatry*. We on the other side, grant, that it is not *Idolatry*, in the highest Sense of the Word, and in the Sense in which they commonly understand it, *viz.* The owning a Creature to be *GOD*. So that so far we are agreed ; but then we say that Word may be used in a lower Sense, to denote what they grant to be a *Sin*, as well as we, but will not call it by that Name, so that our difference in this Matter, is only about the use of a Word.

Now we think our selves in the right in the use of this Word, upon these Accounts.

I. Because we have no other Name to express that which is not denied to be a very great Sin, The giving *God's Worship* to *Creatures* ; and having no peculiar Name for it, we think it not improper to give it the Name of that Sin which is of nearest *affinity* to it, and of the same *general kind* ; as is done in many other Cases.

What a very reasonable argument.

Thus

of the Roman Communion. 67

Thus our Saviour calls looking upon a Woman to lust after her, by the name of *Adultery*, and the like. The next step to owning a Creature to be GOD, is to give it the *Worship* due to GOD, and therefore we think it not at all improper to call these two Sins by the same general Name, especially having no Word in our Language, more proper by which we may express it.

2. We think our selves fully justified in the Expression, because the Scripture does every where charge the Heathen Worship of their *Gods* and *Images* in general, with the Crime of *Idolatry*; tho' nothing can be more apparent than that many of the Heathen owned only *one Supreme GOD*, and that all of them looked upon many of the *Gods*, whom they Worshipped, not as *Supreme*, but as *Gods* of an *Inferior Nature*, and had much the same Opinion of them, as the Romanists have now of *Saints* and *Angels*, and had the very same *pretences* and *excuses* for the *Worshipping* of them which the *Romanists* make use of to defend themselves. They owned many of their *Gods* to have been *born*, and to have *died*, and it was hardly possible to look upon any such, to be the *Supreme GOD*. In a Word,

Word, There is nothing more evident than this, that they had several *Ranks*, and *Orders*, and *Degrees* among their Gods, and it was impossible to look upon all these to be *Supreme* : And yet the Scripture every where without any distinction, charges their *whole Worship* with *Idolatry* ; and so do the *Primitive Fathers*, as well as the Scriptures ; particularly, they thought it to be *Idolatry* to throw a *little Incense* into the Fire before the *Statues* of their *Emperors*. From whence we may plainly infer these Two Things ;

First, That they thought that there might be *Idolatry* in giving such Worship as was *appropriated to GOD*, to Creatures, tho' they were not pretended to be any thing else but *Creatures*, only Creatures highly exalted, and in high Favour with GOD, as Saints and Angels are supposed to be.

Secondly, That they looked upon the offering of *Incense*, to be a part of *Worship appropriated to GOD* and that could not be given to a *Creature* without the Crime of *Idolatry* ; which is a Matter the *Church of Rome* have reason to consider well of, who offer it every Day to those, who however they

of the Roman Communion. 69

they may have been better *Men*, are certainly no more *Gods* than the *Heathen Emperors* were.

To conclude this Matter, The Sense of the *Primitive Church* in the business of *Idolatry*, is plainly seen in this, that they every where accuse the *Arians* of *Idolatry* for *Worshipping* of *Jesus Christ*, for this very Reason, because they owned him not to be *GOD*, or at least, not the *Supreme GOD*; from whence it plainly appears, that they had the same Notions in this Case, that we now have, That Men may be guilty of *Idolatry* in giving *Divine Worship* to what they believe is not *GOD*.

Thirdly, The *Apostle* calls *Covetousness* *Idolatry*; which, tho' it be a figurative Expression, yet however, denotes to us the thing for which I am now pleading, The Covetous Man does not look upon his *Money* to be his *GOD*, or intend to give it any of that *Worship* he thinks due to *GOD*; I believe no Covetous Man in the World can be justly charged with either of these; but because he places his *Heart* and his *Affections* upon it, which ought to be given to none but *GOD*; because his *Money* is the thing in which he puts his *trust* and
his

his *confidence*, therefore it is, that he is said to make an *Idol* of it, and to be guilty of *Idolatry*: And so it is as to the Worshipping of *Saints*, tho' their Worshippers know very well that they are not *Gods*, yet because they give them the Worship of *GOD*, that outward *Adoration*, and inward *Reverence*, *hope*, *trust*, and *dependance* which are due only to *GOD*, they do by that make them *Idols*, and are justly chargeable with *Idolatry*.

I now proceed to the *Second Point*, To shew, that the Worship which the Church of *Rome* gives to the *Blessed Virgin*, and other *Saints*, by the *Invocation* practised among them, is *Divine Worship*, such as ought to be given to none but *GOD*.

We are not concern'd at present, to enquire into the *Doctrine* of the Church of *Rome*, but into the *Practice*; that being the thing particularly Censur'd in the *Test-Act*; tho' indeed, the *Practice* of any Church, is the best Exposition of Her *Doctrine*. The *Council of Trent* leaves this Matter in general Terms, determines that we must seek

Opem Auxili-
umq; Sefs. 25.

the help and aid of the Saints, but does not fix the Measures of it: However, since it does not Censure what was then the Com-
mon

of the Roman Communion. 71

mon Practice of that Church, we may take it for granted, that the meaning of the *Council* was, that we must *seek their aid and help* in the *Methods* which were then in *use*; for if they disapproved of what was then commonly Practised, it concerned them much to speak out, as to set their own People right, and to keep them out of dangerous Practices; so also to vindicate the Honour of their Church, which was then openly charged with *Idolatry* upon account of those Practices.

We agree with the Church of *Rome* in this, That we ought to have a great *honour and respect* for the *Saints* of GOD. That we ought to *love* their Memory, to endeavour to imitate the good Examples they have left us, and to bless GOD for the Benefits he has bestowed upon the Church by their means.

And above *other Saints*, we ought to have a great esteem and value for the *Blessed Virgin*, who had the Honour to be the *Mother* of our *Lord*, and by that, to be so nearly concerned in the greatest Blessing that ever was bestowed upon the World.

But we differ from that Church in this, That they *Adore* the *Saints* and *Pray* to them;

them ; and that not as one *Friend* would desire another to *Pray* for him, but with all the *solemn Ceremonies* and *Circumstances* of *Prayer*, and with the very same with which they pray to *GOD* ; they do it in their *Churches*, *Kneeling*, and with their *Eyes lift up to Heaven*, and with all the signs of *Devotion* which can be shewed not only from one *Creature* to another, but from a *Creature to its Creator*. They make *Vows* to them ; burn *Incense* to their *Images* ; *dedicate* themselves to their *Service* ; make *Offerings* to them, and the like.

They pray to them directly to bestow Blessings upon them. Thus in the Office of the *Blessed Virgin*, She is not only called the *Gate of Heaven*, but she is intreated to *loose the bonds of the Guilty*, to *give light to the Blind*, and to *drive away our Evils*, and to *shew her self to be a Mother*. They pray to her therein, for *Purity of Life*, and a *safe Conduct to Heaven*. She is commonly called the *Queen of Heaven*, the *Mother of Mercy*, and which is most Shameful of all, The *Psalms of David*, Composed for the *Honour of GOD*, and which contain the highest strains of *Devotion* which a *Creature* can give to *GOD*, are
by

by a *Saint* of that Church turned to the Honour of the *Bona Ventura*. *Virgin*, by putting *her* Name where the Name of *GOD* is put by *David*: And this was neither Censured by the *Council of Trent*, nor has been by any *Pope*, that I can hear of, to this Day; but on the contrary, the Author of it has been *Canonized*, and the Book is in *Common use*, which perhaps, is one of the *blackest* pieces of *Idolatry* that ever was in the World. And tho a Church must not always bear the Guilt of what is publish'd by private Persons in her Communion, tho it do pass without Censure; yet considering how careful that Church has been in many Matters of much less moment especially where her *own Authority* is concerned, and how solicitous they are to keep Books that make against them, out of the Hands of their People, it looks at least, like *espousing the Blasphemies*, and *Idolatrous Prayers and Praises* of it, to let this Book go so freely about without Censure, and to *incourage* it so far, as to make the *Author* of it a *Saint*.

These, and many other Instances, might be given of the *Worship* they give to the *Blessed Virgin*; and tho they are somewhat

H more

more *modest*, with relation to other *Saints* ; yet what I have taken notice of already, may sufficiently shew, that they give them the Worship which GOD has appropriated to himself. I would only therefore mention further, that in many Instances, they pray to them to bestow those Blessings which only GOD can give, such as to *open the Gates of Heaven*, to *untie the Bonds of their Iniquity*, to *heal their spiritual Maladies* ; and many other of the same Nature, of which, I shall give them Examples at large, if required, or if I find it necessary to confirm any thing that I have now said.

I now proceed to take notice of some of those Reasons we have to prove, that this *Invocation* is part of that *Worship* which GOD has appropriated to himself, and which consequently cannot be given to any *Creature*, without the Crime of *Idolatry*.

I. I desire it may be considered, that the Scripture does every where speak of *Prayer* as applied to GOD, and to none else, and that without the least intimation of any such *Distinctions* as are made use of in the Church of *Rome*. We have in the *Old Testament*, the History of the Church of GOD, for near 4000 Years ; and in all that time, there

there is not the least instance, or intimation, of any *Prayer* put up to any *Creature*.

It may be it will be said, That the *Saints* were not then in *Heaven*, and so were not in a condition to *hear* the *Prayers* that should be put up to them, and had not so much *Favour* with *GOD*, as they may be supposed to have now, since the *Resurrection of Christ*, that he as admitted them so nearly into his *Presence*.

Now in answer to this, I shall not at present, pretend to determine, whether the *Saints* of the *Old Testament* were in *Heaven* before *Christ's Resurrection*, or not; nor whether *they*, and other *Saints* since are there now; because a great many *Christians* of no mean *Authority* in the *Church of GOD*, have been of different *Opinions* in these *Matters*; only I think these two or three *Things*, are very plain.

I. That *Enoch* and *Elias* were supposed by a great many, before our *Saviour's* time, to be in *Heaven*; and they must have been looked upon by them, to be very great *Favourites* of *GOD*, by being taken out of this *World* in so strange and wonderful a manner, as the *Scripture* tells us they were; and yet we hear as little

H. 2 of

of *praying* to them, as to any other Person.

2. Supposing it not agreed upon then, whether *Saints* were in *Heaven*, yet all agreed that the *Angels* were. And they were altogether as well capacitated to hear and answer Prayers, which should have been put up to them then, as they are *now*, and yet we find as little of Mens *praying* to *Angels*, as they did to *Saints* in those Times.

3. Whatever Reason can be assigned for *praying* to *Creatures* now, would have held as well *then*; whatever *necessity*, or *convenience*, or *advantage*, or *fitness* there may be in it, were all the same, and indeed much greater then, than they are now, upon these two Accounts.

1. Because the *Christian Religion* is of it self a State of much *greater Perfection* than any Dispensation that was before it. GOD has in it revealed himself more clearly and plainly to the World, has more evidenced his Love and Tendernefs to Mankind, has given us greater encouragements to draw near to him; He speaks to us in the Gospel as a Father to his Children, as a *reconciled Father* in *JESUS CHRIST*? and therefore accordingly, in that Form of Prayer which our Saviour has left us, that is the

the Appellation which he has taught us to make use of, *Our Father which art in Heaven*; Now, why should a Child be afraid to approach the Presence of his Father? Or, what need has he of any Body to introduce him? under the *Jewish Dispensation*, when the Law was given with *Thunderings and Lightnings*, when GOD was called by the terrible Name of the *Lord of Hosts*, there might be more reason to think of some Body to introduce them to his Presence; which yet we do not find was ever recommended, or practised among them: How much more may Christians come with boldness to the Throne of Mercy, and expect to find Grace to help in time of need? But what is more considerable.

2. Christians have *Christ* for their Mediator, who is able to save to the uttermost all those that come to GOD by him; He is in Heaven ready to plead their Cause, and to get their Prayers heard, and their Persons accepted; and they that have such an Advocate, need not fly to any else. But it was not so with the Church before *Christ*; and therefore if the thing had been at all lawful, they had much more reason to make *Saints* and *Angels* their Patrons, than Christians have.

have. And yet we see that in the Account which we have in the *Bible* of the Church of GOD before CHRIST for near 4000 Years, there is not the least hint of any thing of this kind.

3. What I have said already, that all along in the *Old Testament*, Prayer is appropriated to GOD, and that without any *reserve*, or *distinction*, may be sufficient to shew the Mind of GOD in that Case : But I have this further to add, That the same Scriptures, with the same general Words, condemn as *Idolatrous* all the *old Heathen Worship* : Now I have shewed before, that much of this *Worship* was paid to *Creatures*, under the same Notions and Apprehensions, that those of the Church of *Rome* Worship *Saints* and *Angels* ; indeed there was this difference, that most of those Worshipped in the Church of *Rome*, were probably *good Creatures*, as most of those whom the *Heathens* Worshipped, were *bad* ones, and it may be *Devils* : But this distinction of *good* or *bad Creatures*, may make the Worship more or less *Impious*, but not more or less *Idolatrous* ; whatever will make it *Idolatry* in the one Case, will make it so in the other. The Worship appropriated

ated to GOD, is no more due to a good Creature, than it is to a *bad* one; since therefore I have shewed, that the Scripture every where condemns the Worship which the Heathen gave to what they owned not to be GOD, and which they did not intend to Worship as the Supreme GOD; I say, since this is condemned, not only as *Impious*, for choosing ill *Creatures*, but as *Idolatrous* for giving what belonged only to GOD: this must equally prove all *Creature Worship* to be *Idolatrous*.

4. This Creature Worship, is as little heard of in the *New Testament* as it is in the *Old*. Heard of, it is indeed, but what approbation it met with, we may see by considering these particulars.

The *first* Instance is that of the *Devil* desiring our *Saviour* to *Worship* him, upon promise to give him *all the Kingdoms of the World*: But let us see what our *Saviour* answers; he does not put him off with telling him either the *Dignity* of his own Person, or the unsuitness of the thing, in Worshipping him because he was a Devil; but he gives such a Reason as will hold against all Worshipping of *Creatures*. *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy GOD, and him only*

ly shalt thou Serve. From which Words, I would observe these Two Things.

1. That the Worship which the *Devil* desires, and which our *Saviour* says must be given *only* to *GOD*, was not to *offer Sacrifice* to him, which the Writers of the Church of *Rome*, make the only outward Worship appropriated to *GOD*, but it was to *fall down* and *adore* him; from whence we may infer, that to *fall down* and *adore* any Creature, must be Idolatry, which part of Worship its apparent the Church of *Rome* give to their *Saints and Angels*.

2. I would observe here, that the *Devil* did not pretend to be the *Supreme GOD*, but plainly the contrary; for when he shews our *Saviour* all the Kingdoms of the World, he tells him, that all these things were *given* to him, *Luke 4. 6.* in which he plainly professes, not a *Supreme* But a *Delegated* Power; so that had not our *Saviour* in his Answer, condemned the Worship of *Creatures*, tho' *owned and acknowledged* to be *Creatures*, he had not given a full Answer to the *Devil*, for the *Devil* did not desire to be *Worshipped* as the *Supreme GOD*.

Another Instance we have of this kind, is that of *St. John* in the *Revelations* falling
down

of the Roman Communion. 81

down to Worship the *Angel*, who we see puts him off it, with the same kind of general Words, that our Saviour uses in the former Instance, *See thou do it not, I am thy fellow Servant, Worship GOD*, Rev. 22. 18, 19. Here I would observe, as in the former Case, that the Worship which the *Angel rejects*, and *appropriates to GOD*, is falling down at his feet to Adore him. And in the next place, I would observe, that had Adoration been due to an Angel, the true Answer to St. *John* had been, that he should have a care not to mistake him to be *GOD*, who was but an *Angel*, and so give him more than was due to him; but we see he throws off the whole without any reserve or distinction, and for a Reason that will hold against all Creature Worship that he was his *Fellow-servant*. In a word, it had been no great secret for the Angel to tell St. *John*, that *GOD* was to be *Worshipped*, or that *GOD only* was to be *Worshipped* with an *inward apprehension*, of his being *GOD*, neither of these were any great Mystery, or to the purpose. And therefore his meaning must be, that Religious Worship, such as that Adoration was, ought to be given to none but *GOD*.

I shall name but one more place of Scripture, in which this *Creature Worship* is taken notice of, and that is *Coloss. 2. 18. Let no man beguile you of your reward by a voluntary humility, and Worshipping of Angels.* The Apostle in this, and the following Verses, makes use of Two Arguments against the Worshipping of Angels. First, that it is a *voluntary Humility*, that is, tho' Men may pretend a great deal of Humility, that it is not fit for such mean Creatures as they to go directly into the presence of GOD, but that they ought to apply to the Angels of GOD to be their Introducers; yet all this, is Humility of their own inventing, such as GOD has not required at their hands.

2. That this Worshipping of Angels, is *leaving Christ their Head*; He is the only *Mediator betwixt GOD and Men*, and therefore applying to any other, is leaving him who is the Head of the Church; and then no wonder if it *beguile us of our reward*. This Argument is very plain and very strong against the practice of Praying to *Saints* or *Angels*, and it hath this one thing very observable in it, That if this Text proves it unlawful to set up any more *Mediators* but *Jesus Christ*, it must be understood of

Mediators

of the Roman Communion. 83

Mediators of Intercession, for no body could so much as pretend, that *Angels* were *Mediators of Redemption*, as those of the Church of *Rome* (without any ground at all) make the distinction.

I might shew farther the *Idolatry* of this Practice, of praying to *Saints* and *Angels*, from this, that it must suppose *Divine Perfections* in the *Creatures* to whom we pray; as of *Power* to be able to supply our *Wants*, especially, in those Prayers that are put up to them directly to beg such or such Blessings from them; and so of *Knowledge*, because Prayer (at least Mental Prayer) supposes that the Persons we pray to, know our Hearts, and the secret thoughts, and sincerity or insincerity of all the Men and Women in the World, and that they can perfectly attend to them all at the same time; which are Perfections that the Scripture never attributes to any but GOD, and in the Nature of the thing, it is hardly conceivable of any Creature; but I shall content my self to have named these things, and shall conclude this whole Matter, with just proposing these two short Considerations.

1. I desire it may be considered, that in the Church of *Rome* there is no External part of Religion *appropriated* to GOD, and *incommunicable* to Creatures, but the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, and if in the preceding Discourses, I have overthrown the foundation of that, there is then nothing at all remaining.

2. I desire it may be considered that the Reasons commonly given to justify Prayers to *Saints and Angels*, would, if well followed, hinder Men from ever praying to GOD at all, as in fact, this has much estranged Men from GOD in those Countries where they have had no *Protestants* among them to make them ashamed of it; and even nearer our selves, I believe, we may justly say, that at least Ten Prayers are put up to Creatures for one that is put up to GOD.

Of the Pope's
Supremacy.

I now come to consider the *Oath of Supremacy* which consists of Two Parts.

I. A *Declaration* of the Unlawfulness, and *Impiety* of taking up Arms against the King upon Account of His being *Excommunicated*, or *Deprived* by the Pope.

II. A

II. A Renunciation of the *Pope's* pretended Supremacy over the Church of *Christ*, particularly over that part of it in this Kingdom.

As to the *First of these*, I need not insist upon it, because if I can prove, the Second, *That the Pope has of right no Spiritual Power* here, the other must of course fall with it. I would only observe before I proceed, That if those of the *Roman Communion* among us, do believe, that the *Pope* has a Power from *GOD* to *Excommunicate*, and to *Deprive* Princes of their Kingdoms for *Heresy*, and that therefore they are bound to concur with the *Pope* as far as they can, to put his Sentence in *Execution*, this must make them *Enemies* to all *Protestants*, and consequently, they have reason to expect that *Protestants* should have a care of them. But if they do believe that *GOD* has not given any such Power to the *Pope*, they have then Reason to have a care of their *Guide*, who is doing what he can, under pretence of Authority from *GOD*, to carry them to *Treason* and *Murther*, and all the *Villanies* which must follow an attempt to turn out their *King*, and all his *Protestant Subjects* that will stand by him: But I have

in some measure taken notice of these things already, and therefore shall not now enlarge upon them; but proceed to consider the Grounds of the Pope's pretence to *Supremacy*.

The Opinion of the Church of *Rome*, with relation to his *Supremacy* is this, That *Jesus Christ* made *Saint Peter* the *Supreme Governor* and *Head*, as of all the rest of the *Apostles*, so also of the *whole Church*; That *St. Peter* was afterward *Bishop* of *Rome*, and that by Divine Appointment his *Successors* the *Bishops* of *Rome*, are to enjoy the same *Supremacy* over the *Church* which he had.

Their Opinion about the *Supremacy* of *St. Peter*, is founded chiefly upon those Words of our Saviour, *Mat. 16. 18, 19. Upon this Rock I will build my Church— And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* They say, our Saviour does by these Words, promise to *St. Peter* to make him *Monarch* of the whole *Church*: We say, that tho' these Words were spoken to *St. Peter* upon occasion of his speaking to our Saviour immediately before, yet that this Promise does as much belong to the rest of the *Apostles*, as it does to *him*, and that therefore, whatever Power

of the Roman Communion. 87

er may be here promised to him over the *Church*, there is none promised over the rest of the *Apostles*, and that consequently, his *Successors* can claim nothing from hence over the *Successors* of all the *Apostles*, the other *Bishops* of the *Christian Church*.

But to consider this Matter more particularly, we may take notice,

1. That the rest of the *Apostles* did not apprehend that *St. Peter* had here any peculiar Power promised him above them; for we find that not long after, they were contending, who should be the *greatest*; by which it's plain, they did not then apprehend that our Saviour had already determined the Matter: And as for our *Saviour* himself, he does not at all endeavour to put them right, as it was of great consequence he should do, supposing that he designed *St. Peter* for their *Governour*; but he endeavours to teach them all humility, and not to affect Power or Authority over one another. And the same instance we have in the Case of *Zebedee's Children*, when their Mother came to desire that the one might sit on his right hand and the other on his left in his Kingdom, that is, that they might be the Persons of chief Favour, and

Authority with him ; their Petition plainly implies, that they knew nothing of *St. Peter's Prerogatives* ; and our *Saviour's Answer*, which you may see at large, *Mat. 20.* implies as plainly, that neither *St. Peter*, nor any body else, was to have such Power in the Church, as the Bishops of *Rome* have since pretended to.

2. I would observe, that these Words of our *Saviour* to *St. Peter*, do not actually invest him with any Power, but are only a *Promise* to him ; and therefore the best way to see what was peculiar to him in it above the rest of the *Apostles*, will be to see the *fulfilling* of the *Promise*, and his being *actually Invested* in it. That this is only a *Promise* appears from the Words themselves, which run in the future Tense, *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven* : And I believe, they of the Church of *Rome* will not deny this, because they say, that the *Apostles* were not *Priests* till our *Saviour* made them so in the Institution of the *Lord's Supper*. Now if we consider the *actual Investiture* into this Power, there is nothing peculiar to *Saint Peter*. Our *Saviour* gives them all their Power together, in Words much of the same Nature

ture with that Promise before to St. Peter ; *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained.* And as for the Expression, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*, there is much the same said of all the *Apostles*. The Church is said to be *built upon the foundation of the Apostles, and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.*

3. The best way to see whether St. Peter had any such *Supremacy*, will be to see whether he exercised any, whether he did any *Acts*, or *Offices* which belong to so high a Power. There must be constantly so many occasions for the exercise of that Power, that if he had any such we could not miss of Instances of it. The Times of the *Apostles* were indeed, Times of greater *Simplicity*, than these later Ages ; and therefore I do not expect they should shew me St. Peter Commanding after the manner of our *Modern Popes* : But if they can shew me any one single Act of *Authority* over the rest of the *Apostles* ; if they can shew me St. Peter of himself, making Laws, and Orders for the good Government of the Church, or so much as *presiding*

ding in the *College* of the *Apostles* ; if they can shew me any *Appeals* made to him, or *Controversies* ended by him, or, among so many *Controversies* as happened, any advice to repair to him, or command to obey him ; I shall not shut my *Eyes* against the *Discoveries*. But to consider this *Matter* a little more particularly : As soon as our *Blessed Saviour* was *Ascended*, there was an occasion given to exercise this *Supremacy* in chusing a new *Apostle* in the room of *Judas*, *Acts* 1. But we see that the method taken was, that the whole *Multitude* chose *Two*, and then they cast *Lots* which of the *Two* should be the *Apostle*. And so as to the choosing of *Deacons*, *Acts* 7. the whole *Multitude* chose them, and presented them, not to *Peter*, but to all the *Apostles* to be *Ordained*.

If we look a little further into the *Acts of the Apostles* to *Chap.* 8. We shall find the *Apostles* not sent by *St. Peter* up and down to their business as occasion required, but *St. John* and *him* sent by them to *Samaria* ; which was not very *mannerly* nor very *fit* had they known him to be their *Sovereign*.

Acts. 11. we find those of the *Circumcision*, contending with him, and forcing him

to

to give an account of his Actions, and that without any Ceremony, or deference proper for one in so high a Place ; and we see he patiently submits to it, without standing upon his Prerogative of being unaccountable, without chiding them for their Insolence, or any thing of that kind.

Acts. 15. we find a solemn Meeting of the *Apostles* and *Brethren* at *Jerusalem*, where *St. Peter* speaks, indeed, as any other Man might have done, but does not *preside* or *determine* any thing. The *Appeal* was to the *Apostles* and *Elders* at *Jerusalem*, not to *him* alone ; and if any thing in the whole Meeting was done *Authoritatively* by any single Person, it was by *St. James*, for he passes Sentence, as you may see *Verse 19.*

If we go to the *Epistles*, we shall find as little evidence of his Authority, as we have in the *History* of the Church in the *Acts* of the *Apostles*.

The first *Epistle* is, that to the *Romans*, not from *St. Peter*, but from *St. Paul* ; where there is not the least notice taken either of *St. Peter*, or of the great *Prerogatives* of that Church, which, one would think, could hardly be avoided if *St. Paul* had

had known any thing of them ; nay he says, some things which directly contradict their Pretences, which you may see *Chap.*

11. He tells them there, that he speaks *to them who were Gentiles, as being the Apostle of the Gentiles* ; and if so, *St. Peter* must not have had so near a relation to them, because he was the *Apostle of the Jews*. Then he proceeds to advise them to have a care of themselves, lest they should fall away, and be cut off ; as you may see *ver. 20. 21.* *Be not high minded but fear, for if GOD spared not the natural Branches, take heed, lest he also spare not thee.* It's plain, that *St. Paul* at that time knew nothing of the great Privileges of that Church, of its being the *Mother and Mistress of all Churches* of its being the *Center of Church Unity*, and of its being *Infalibly secured from Error and Apostacy*.

If we go on to the *Epistle to the Corinthians* we shall find there a very proper occasion to mention *St. Peter's* Authority, if he had any such as they boast of, as you may see *1 Eph. Chap. 1.* *Now this I say, that every one of you saith I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas [or Peter] and I of Christ ; is Christ divided, or was Paul*
Crucified

of the Roman Communion. 93

Crucified for you? &c. Those People certainly knew nothing of *St. Peter's Supremacy*, nor *St. Paul* neither, otherwise he would hardly have omitted to tell them of such an *Infallible Cure* for their *Divisions*.

In the Epistle of *St. Paul* to the *Galatians* we have many Arguments against *St. Peter's* pretended *Supremacy*; *St. Paul* tells us there that he had no *Superior*, that he had his *Authority* from none but *Christ*, Ch. 1. 17. He compares himself with *St. Peter*, and says that the *Ministry of the Uncircumcision* was committed to him as the *Ministry of the Circumcision* was unto *Peter*, Chap. 2. v. 7. He mentions *St. Peter* as of the same Authority with *James* and *John*, when *James, Cephas and John* who seemed to be *Pillars*, Verse the 9th. And a little further he tells us, how he openly withstood *Peter* to the Face, *because he was to be blamed*. All these things might be urged at large, but I content my self only to mention them. But from all together, I think, I may well conclude, that this *Promise* of our *Saviour* did not intend *St. Peter* any Power over the rest of the *Apstles*, and consequently, not any to his *Successors* (if he had any) over the *Bishops* of the *Christian Church*,
who

who are *Successors* of the *Apostles* in general; tho' we do not deny, but *St. Peter* had a Power over the whole Church, but only as the *rest* of the *Apostles* had, whole *Care*, and consequently *Authority*, was not confined to *particular* Churches, as it was thought fit in order to the better Government of the Church, that the Authority of *Bishops* should be since, but was left at large, and unconfin'd as to any certain limits either of Persons or Places.

But suppose it should be granted, that *St. Peter* had such Power, as they affirm he had, yet there is not one Word in *Scripture* about a *Successer*, or about the vast *Privileges* of the Church of *Rome* in this Point. And in truth, there is as little evidence in the *History* of the Church for many Ages, of this pretended-Authority of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as there is in the *Scriptures*.

Rome was at the time of the Planting the Christian Religion, a vast City, and the *Head* of a very great *Empire*: This must of it self, give the *Bishop* of it a great influence in the Affairs of the Church, which was almost all within the *Roman* Empire; this made all sort of Communication with him easy, by means of the
mighty

mighty resort that was made from all Parts to the Capital City ; and the Greatness of his See, did in course of Time bring great Riches to it, and if we add to this, that it was honoured by the *Preaching* and *Martyrdom* of two great Apostles, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, we see plain Reasons why the Bishops of *Rome* were likely to make a great Figure in the Church ; but as for *real Authority*, such as is now pretended, there do not appear any footsteps of it for several Ages.

As for Speculative Opinions, We may not perhaps have so certain an account of them so long after, unless of those which by some accident or other came to be Disputed. But Government is a Practical thing, and there happens every day Occasion to exercise it, especially the Government of the *whole Church* ; and if the *Pope* had been from the beginning what he pretends to be, and what he now makes himself, his Power could have been no more a matter of Controversy, than it could be made a Controversy whether there were any *Christian Church* ; for the same History that clears the one, must at the same time clear the other.

The

The *Old Body* of History of the Christian Church is that of *Eusebius*, which contains an account of the Affairs of it for above 300 Years ; now if the Pope were *Monarch* of the Church for those 300 Years, we can no more miss to see it in that History, than we can read any History of *England* for such a Number of Years, and be uncertain whether we had here any *King* or no, for so long a time : No History hardly can be conceived so faulty or imperfect, as to leave such a Matter a Secret or uncertain ; And yet I would Challenge any indifferent Person to read that *History* over, and to shew me but any one thing in it from which it can be probably inferred, that the Bishop of *Rome* was the *Governour* of the *whole* Church ; whereas, were it truly so, there must have been something of it in almost every Page ; Because all the business of the Church must in a manner roul upon him. He must be the Person appeal'd to in almost all Difficulties, we must have found his Decrees in all the great Affaires that passed, His Decretal Epistles must have been interspersed up and down in the whole Work ; his Authority must have put an end to all *Schisms* and

and *Heresies*, or at least their *Rebellion* against him must have been reckoned as one great part of their Crime. In a word (as I said before) the thing must have appeared as plain as that there was any *King* in *England* for these last 300 Years.

Next to that *History* the most likely place to find his *Authority*, if he had any, is in the Works of St. *Cyprian*, which contain more of the *Antient Discipline* and *Government* of the Church, than is to be found in any other *Old Author*, especially, if we add further, that a great part of his Works is only *Letters* to, or from *Bishops of Rome*. We could not but see, in such a number of Letters, whether he wrote to his *Sovereign* or not; we should see it in the *Titles* which he gives him, in his *Style*, in the deference which he pays him. In short, the whole would some how or other shew that it was his *Superior* he was writing to, but now the contrary to this is true. He never speaks to him, or of him in his Letters to other People, but by the Name of *Brother*; he freely Censures him and his Opinions, just as he would do by any other Man, and with as little deference or respect; and he finally differed from him in a Matter of great consequence, that of *Re-baptizing Hereticks*, and called *Councils* of the Clergy, and raised a great Party against him in it, and yet was never, that I have heard of, charged either with *Rebellion*, or *Schism*, or *Heresy* upon that account;

but is to this day reputed a *Saint* in *Heaven*.

To conclude this Matter, The whole *Discipline* of the Ancient Universal Church, plainly shews that the *Government* of it was an *Aristocracy*, especially, that strict Account that *Bishops* were to give to their Fellow *Bishops* up and down the World, of their *Ordination*, and their *Faith*, and other Matters in order to hold *Communion* with one another, which as it is left off since the *Pope's* Authority came up, so the use of it, must have been inconsistent with it, for it was taking the *Judgment* of *Things* and *Persons* into their own Hands, which must not have belonged to them, but to the *Sovereign High Priest*.

In a word, their *forging* so many *Decretal Epistles* for the *Bishops* of *Rome* for so many *Ages*, is a plain Argument that they have no *true* *Evidences* of the exercise of such Authority in the *Antient Church*, as is now pretended to. Had such Authority been then exercised they needed not have been put to the *forging* *Evidences* of it; we could not easily have miss'd of as many true *Decretal Epistles*, as we have now *forged* ones, something or other we must at least, have heard of theirs, upon all the *Emergent* *Controversies* and *Difficulties* that happen'd in the Church: In short, We must have known of the Authority of the *Popes* of those *Ages*, by the same methods we know of the Authority of the then *Emperors*, by their *Actions*, by their *Laws*, by their *Rescripts*, by their *Bulls*,

Bulls, and by the whole Course of their Government. And therefore we must not judge of a thing of that Nature, by some few *accidental* and *general* Expressions in Authors, or by *Compliments*, which the *Bishops* of so great a See could not easily miss of.

The *last* Argument I shall make use of is this, That it is not easily to be believed, that *Jesus Christ* has left such an Authority in his Church without leaving at least, some Rules about it ; such as *how*, and *by whom* the Person who is invested with it is to be *Chosen*, *how* his Authority is to be *executed*, and what are the *bounds* and *limits* of it, or whether it has any *bounds* or no : These are Matters of great consequence, which have been the occasion of a great many *Schisms*, and might have been, or may still be the occasion of a great many more ; Besides, that so vast an *Office* without any set limits, is mighty apt to degenerate into *Tyranny*, and to betray Men into great *Exorbitancies*, to tempt them to leave the *Simplicity* of the Gospel, to *Usurp* upon the Rights of other People, and to affect at last, a *Secular Dominion* instead of a *Spiritual Office*.

In fact, the want of some such Rules to limit and confine his Authority has made great differences in the Church of *Rome* about this Matter : *Some* say, he has a *plenitude* of Power ; *others* say, that he is confined to the *Canons* of the Church ; *some* say, that he is above a *General Council*, *others* deny it ; *some* say, that he has

An Address to those

the *Supreme Authority* over all the World, not only in *Spirituals*, but also in *Temporals*, that he has a Power to *Erect Kingdoms*, to give away Kingdoms to *deprive* Princes of their Dominions, and to take away the Obligation of Subjects to their *Allegiance*; others there are, who either *qualify* this with *distinctions*, or else quite *deny* it; lastly, some there are who say, that he is *Infallible*, that what he *solemnly* determines ought to be a *Rule and Law* to all Christians, and to be taken as the Dictate of the *Holy Ghost* but many there are who *deny* this too; besides all which, there are many Disputes about his Power of granting *Indulgencies*, his *dispensing* with *Oaths and Vows*, and with the *Laws* both of GOD and the Church. These are Differences of great moment, both with relation to *Faith and Practice*, and may carry Men as different ways as *Light and Darkness* are different, or as different as *Truth* is from the most *monstrous Heresies* in the World. Thus if the *Pope* be not above a *General Council* he may carry those into a State of *Schism and Disobedience* who believe he is; if he cannot dispense with *Oaths and Laws*, and *Vows*, he may carry those into great *Sins* who believe he can; if he cannot *Depose Princes*, he may carry those into *Rebellion, Perjury, Murther*, and all sorts of *Villanies* who are led by him; and if he be not *Infallible*, as he pretends to be, GOD knows whither he may carry those who follow him; And so on the other side,

if

of the Roman Communion. 101

if he has all these *Prerogatives*, they are in as much danger who say, that he has not.

If Christ had thought fit to appoint a *Head* of his Church, I cannot imagine, but He would have given the Church some Rules about his Power, and the Obedience that was due to him : And I cannot but wonder how the same Church holds Persons that are of so contrary Opinions in Matters of this consequence : Let us only consider that single Point of the *Pope's Infallibility* ; I have already shewed that those who do believe it, must have a different *Rule of Faith* from those who do not, because his *Determinations* must be part of the *Rule* of their Faith, and consequently, they must have a different *Religion*, from those who do not believe it. But that which I would insist upon at present, is this, That for a Person to affirm himself to be *Infallible*, and to be appointed by GOD for the *Supreme Guide* and *Conductor* of the Faith of Christians, so that whatsoever he shall *solemnly determine* must be believed true *without examining* ; I say, for a Person to affirm this of himself, supposing it be false, is downright *Heresy*, and that as *grosse* and *dangerous* Heresy as almost any Man can fall into : Now to illustrate this, I would only propose one thing ; Suppose *Henry VIII.* instead of those other Matters in which he differed from the Church of *Rome*, had affirmed only this one Point ; That GOD had made him *Infallible*, and appointed him to be the

Guide of all Christians: Would this have made him a Heritick, or would it not? There is no Question, but they must say, this would have made him and all his Followers so, or if there be any worse Name by which they could call them; for if he were in their Opinion, a Heretick for pretending to be the *Head* only of the *Church of England*, and that without *Infallibility*; How much more must the other have made him so? Now what is *Heresy* in one, must be *Heresy* in every body, supposing it equally false; for *Heresy* is not made so by difference of Persons, but by the *Nature of Things*. All therefore that believe the *Pope* not to be *Infallible*, must as much believe this Pretence to be *Heresy* in him, and his followers, as they would in the Case of *Henry VIII.* for the *Matter* is the same in both, and the Pretence supposed to be equally false in both, but must be much more dangerous in the *Pope*, because more People are like to be seduced by him. That Reason which makes those of the *Roman Church* who deny his *Infallibility*, yet not speak, or think so severely of it, as they would do of the same Pretence in another Man, is really so far from excusing it, that it aggravates the Matter and makes it worse and much more dangerous than it would be in any other: They do not speak out, because the Person who pretends to this Privilege, has great Authority among them, and is at the Head of their Church, whereas this is the very thing which makes

makes such a Pretence the more pernicious, that he has great Authority even with the *whole Body* of that Church, and has a very great Number of them, who say, That if he determines *Vertue to be Vice*, and *Vice to be Vertue*; and the same, if he determines *Infidelity to be Faith*, yet he must be followed: GOD knows how many People such a one may carry with him into *Heresies*, or *Immoralities*, or even to *Hell* it self.

Perhaps they think that GOD will take care of his *Church*, and will not suffer any thing of that kind to happen; but sure they have little reason to expect such a miraculous care over them, who encourage the *Pope* and his *Followers* in such a *pestilent Heresy*, by living in Communion with him, and owning him for the Head of their Church. But besides, how do they main that GOD will take care of his Church, when he has suffered a Person, whom they own to be the *Head* of it, to fall into such a dangerous *Heresy*? Will GOD preserve him, that he shall fall into no other *Heresies*? How do they know that, or how can they expect it? If any thing puts a Man out of the care and protection of GOD, certainly such a false pretence as that, is most likely to do it: And as for those who will stick by such a Person notwithstanding they see the falseness of his Pretences, they have reason to expect, that GOD *should give them over to strong delusions*, rather than take any extraordinary

traordinary care of them while they are in such a way.

I have now done with what I *at first propos-*
ed to speak to, And I cannot but hope that I
have said enough to give you just reason to
comply with the Laws of your Country in
these matters. This I am sure of, that I have
not willingly *misrepresented* any thing, or made
use of any *reasoning* which did not first *convince*
my self; If, in this short *Address*, I have not
answered all the difficulties in these matters,
or if you desire satisfaction in the other points
of Controversy betwixt us and your Church,
I must renew my Request to you, that you
would consult some of our *Divines*, or read
some of those *Books* which have been written
upon the several *Subjects*, which I am per-
swaded, can hardly fail of Convincing you, if
they are read impartially. As for *my self*, if
I find by the success of this, that any thing I
can do, may help forward your Conversion, I
shall be very glad to take any further pains
in it; And in the mean time shall not fail to
put up my Prayers to Almighty GOD on your
behalf, that he would be pleased to take away
all Prejudice, to open your Eyes and bring
you to the knowledge of the Truth.

FINIS.

92 90/108-3

